

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-5 remain in the application.

In item 3 on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 1-5 have been rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

The Examiner considered the material on lines 27-32 of claim 1 to be confusing.

Counsel requested a telephone conference with the Examiner, and the Examiner kindly granted the request after a brief delay to retrieve the case. Applicants are appreciative of the additional effort of the Examiner.

Counsel explained that according to claim 1, a comparator unit will supply an event signal depending on the signal levels received from the storage elements. In the case where the signal levels received from the storage elements are identical, a comparator unit will supply an event signal that is different than the event signal that will be supplied by

the comparator unit when two different signal levels are received from the storage elements.

During the telephone conference, the Examiner indicated that the meaning now seemed to be clear, and that counsel should reference the discussion when responding to the outstanding Office action.

It is accordingly believed that the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Should the Examiner find any further objectionable items, counsel would appreciate a telephone call during which the matter may be resolved.

The Examiner stated that claims 1-5 would be allowed if the 35 U.S.C. § 112 were overcome.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 1. Claim 1 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

Appl. No. 09/756,084
Amdt. dated November 26, 2003
Reply to Office action of 11/10/2003

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-5 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, he is respectfully requested to telephone counsel so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,


Mark F. Weichselbaum
Reg. No. 43,248

For Applicant

MPW:cgm

November 26, 2003

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101



DOCKET NO.	INVENTOR	Amend 1. 116 (No. of Pgs.)	Amend (No. of Pgs.)	Appellal	Assignment (No. of Pgs.)	Brevet Correction	CIP	Claim for Priority	Declaration	Divisional	Express	Fil. RCPD. Correc.	Formal Drawings (No.)	IDS (No. of Refs.)	Int. Drawings (No.)	Issue Fees	Letter	Maintenancce Fee	PCT Cover Sheet	Petition for Ext.	(Ass.) Power of Attorney	Priority Document	RCE	Response	Trademark Application	\$ Amount	\$ Amount	Credit Card	Check	Addit. Info.
MAS-FIN-222	Wannemuth																													
A-2626	Gunschera																													
A-2435C	Wolf																													
HEM01/814(HA-37	Kaya																													
MUH-12157	Czech																													
GR98P1435	Savignac																													
GR98P1173	Fest																													
4,841,222 - 6,026,002																														
WMP-SME-487	Feldteller																													
2601/207-153	Beckmann																													

4 pages appendix

2 Statements 3.7b

GR98P2037 p. 0

五

[inventor] Martin Buck
[Title] Circuit for Determining the Time Difference Between Edge
[Ser. No.] 09/756,084 [Filed] January 8, 2001 [Renewal Filed] _____

Group _____ **Room** _____ **Examiner** _____

Client Epping Hermann & Fischer

Foreign Cases

Germany 19830570.2 July 8, 1998
PCT DE99 02008 July 1, 1999

Allowed _____ **Renewal All'd** _____ **Final Fee Paid** _____

ASSIGNMENT

INTERFERENCE

Declared _____ **No.** _____

Digitized by srujanika@gmail.com

Opponent _____

Opponent _____